



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/829,605 | 04/22/2004 | Michael L. O'Banion | 0275A-000749 | 6857 |
| 7590 | 06/30/2009 | | EXAMINER | |
| Harness, Dickey and Pierce, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303 | | | FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | 3724 | | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 06/30/2009 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/829,605 | Applicant(s) O'BANION ET AL. |
| | Examiner Omar Flores-Sánchez | Art Unit 3724 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/26/09.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,8,10-14,20,22,23 and 47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,8 and 10-12 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13,14,20,22,23 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 12/26/07.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13, 14, 20, 22, 23 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (4,206,672) in view Truan et al. (US 2002/0104178 A1) and Vogl et al. (3,249,134).

Smith discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a support structure/riving knife 56, first and second side curtain (66 and 68) and a first locking assembly 78. Smith doesn't show a second locking assembly having a locking member and a spring. However, Truan et al. teaches the use of a second locking assembly 54 having a locking member 68 and a spring 56 for the purpose of quickly mounting the tool. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Smith by providing the second locking assembly having the locking member and the spring as taught by Truan et al. in order to obtain a device that quickly mounts the tool. The locking mechanism (68 and 56) of Truan et al. is capable of being coupled to the first and second side curtains by the support 58 connected to the mounting member 72 in each of the engaged and disengaged positions.

The modified device of Smith doesn't show a first locking assembly independently removing the curtains. However, Vogl et al. teaches the use of a first locking assembly (40 and 42) independently removing the curtains for the purpose of fully obstructing accidental hand access to the saw. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Smith by providing the first locking assembly independently removing the curtains as taught by Vogl et al. in order to obtain a device that fully obstructs accidental hand access to the saw. The modified device of Smith is capable of performing the intended use of the curtains independently movable relative to the support structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 10-12 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Smith can't be combined with any quick-release mechanism because the holder 72 are closely fitted to the guard member 56 to maintain a tight assembled relationship based upon the pivot pin 70. However, the argument applies only for the embodiment of Fig. 1, since embodiment of Fig. 3-4 discloses the plate holder 72 with guide plates can be *removed quickly* from the cutting tool by removing the pin 70 from the guard member 56 (see col. 5, lines 61-68). Also, the modification of Smith with the quick-release mechanism of Truan et al. is capable of removing the plate holder 72 with guide plates/curtains from the guard member 56.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. F./
Examiner, Art Unit 3724
6/25/2009

/Boyer D. Ashley/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724